



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 09/817,054 | 03/27/2001 | Jeffrey Paul Grundvig | 20-149 | 9186 |
| 7590 | 04/13/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC 2000 M Street, N. W., 7th Floor Washington, DC 20036-3307 | | | | VANDERPUYE, KENNETH N |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2661 | | |

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/817,054 | GRUNDVIG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kenneth N Vanderpuye | 2661 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 6-16 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 1 clearly states that there are more than one of the slot based frames containing synch information. Claim 4 contradicts claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Boehly et al. (3,742,139) With regards to claims 1 the admitted prior art teaches a single slot based data burst comprising: a plurality of time slot based data frames (Fig. 5B). What the admitted prior art fails to teach is the limitation, less than all

but more than one, of said plurality of time slot based data frames including a sync word, remaining ones of said plurality of time slot based data frames not including a sync word. Boehly teaches this feature (col.1 lines 4-35, synchronizing signal present in alternate frames. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching in Boehly with the admitted prior art for the purpose of excluding the synch information from subsequent frames. The motivation is to achieve data bandwidth efficiency and still be able to resynchronize the receiver in case of accidental loss of the synchronization.

Claim 2 is rejected because the admitted prior art teaches TDMA frames.

Claim 5 is rejected because Boehly teaches a data burst wherein said remaining ones of said time slot based data frames include data payload in a position containing said sync word in said less than all of said plurality of time slot based data frames.(inherently obvious since there is no sync signal in the slot).

Claims 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Boehly et al. (3,742,139) and further in view of Marko et al.(5,325,405)

With regards to claim 3 Boehly fails to teach sync information included at the beginning of said less than all of said plurality of time slot based data frames. Marko teaches this feature(Fig. 1b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Boehly with Marko for the purpose of including synch information in the beginning of the time slot. The motivation is to avoid having the receiver to look for the sync information buried somewhere in the frame. This saves time.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-16 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth N Vanderpuye whose telephone number is 571-272-3078. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(7:30-5:00) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KNV
4/11/05



KENNETH VANDERPUYE
PRIMARY EXAMINER